

From: Joe Nowak
To: McAdams, Terry
Date: 1/26/04 11:38AM
Subject: Re: Unimatic PCB cleanup standard

230803



Terry,

The only thing I would like to clarify is that I think we would give them the 8 quarters of monitoring (unless of course the post remedial levels were extremely high which is highly unlikely based on the original gw results) to prove that the remediation to 100ppm was effective before requiring additional remediation. I do not believe we would require additional remediation based on one or two rounds of sampling above standard. This may be what you mean by indicating that unimatic needs to establish that GW standard was not exceeded, however, but I felt it needed to be clarified.

thanks

joe

>>> Terry McAdams 01/26/04 11:21AM >>>
Joe/Gene:

Re: our discussion last week about allowing Unimatic to remove soils down to 100 ppm, rather than 50 ppm.

I discussed the case with my supervisor, Dave Haymes. It turns out that he was the geologist you met with on the case last year. He checked his notes and verified that it was agreed that Unimatic could perform an interim remediation by removing on-site soils down to 100 ppm. If Unimatic could then establish, via additional, approved GW sampling, that the applicable GW standard for PCBs was not being exceeded, no additional removal of on-site soils would be required. This agreement reflects the content of GZA's 5/29/03 letter as well as Joe's 7/24/03 letter and applies, at this time, only to on-site soils not located under the existing building.

If this is everyone's understanding of how this case should proceed, I'll go ahead and finalize the review memo.

terry
2-0958

CC: Fowler, Gene; Haymes, David